

REMARKS


Claims 1-20 are pending in the current application. In an office action dated March 8, 2007 ("Office Action"), the Examiner rejected claims 1, 4-6, 13, and 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Shinohara, U.S. Patent No. 5,742,934 ("Shinohara"), rejected claims 1, 4-6, 13, and 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Colligan, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0065982 ("Colligan"), rejected claims 1, 13, 7, 8, 12, 13, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Manka, U.S. Patent No. 5,072,378 ("Manka"), rejected claims 2, 3, 14, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colligan in view of Sanada et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0083285 ("Sanada"), and rejected claims 2, 3, 10, 14, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manka in view of Sanada and further in view of Suruguchi, U.S. Patent No. 6,928,509 ("Suruguchi"). Applicants' representative respectfully traverses the above-listed rejections.

In the previous response, filed November 27, 2006, Applicants' representative provided detailed arguments with regard to these rejections. The cited references do not address mappings between sectors with different (data-payload) sizes, and do not include a "routing component." Applicants' representative refers to those arguments, rather than repeating them again, in the interest of brevity. In the Office Action, the Examiner stated, in the Response to Arguments section, that Applicants can easily avoid ambiguities "by explicitly making it clear in the claims." Applicants' representative strongly disagrees that there were any ambiguities, but, in order to further prosecution, has amended the independent claims to make it very clear that: (1) sector sizes refer to data payload sizes; and (2) the claimed routing components route each access operation to one or more of a plurality of mass-storage devices. Again, the term "routing" is exceedingly well known in computing to mean directing messages, commands, signals, or packets to one of a number of destinations, or to a destination by one of multiple, possible paths, rather than simply forwarding or transmitting a message, command, signal, or packet to a single entity. Otherwise, any signal line would constitute a router, which those familiar with computer hardware and networking know is simply not consistent with the well-known meaning of the term "router." The claims unambiguously state that access operations are routed to

one or more of a plurality of mass-storage devices.

In Applicant's representative's opinion, all of the claims remaining in the current application are clearly allowable. Favorable consideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Joseph H. Steinmetz et al.
Olympic Patent Works PLLC


Robert W. Bergstrom
Registration No. 39,906

Enclosures:

Postcard
RCE Transmittal

Olympic Patent Works PLLC
P.O. Box 4277
Seattle, WA 98194-0277
206.621.1933 telephone
206.621.5302 fax